

CLASSIFICATION OF DIFFERENTIALS ON QUANTUM DOUBLES AND FINITE NONCOMMUTATIVE GEOMETRY

S. MAJID

ABSTRACT. We discuss the construction of finite noncommutative geometries on Hopf algebras and finite groups in the ‘quantum groups approach’. We apply the author’s previous classification theorem, implying that calculi in the factorisable case correspond to blocks in the dual, to classify differential calculi on the quantum codouble $D^*(G) = kG \bowtie k(G)$ of a finite group G . We give $D^*(S_3)$ as an example including its exterior algebra and lower cohomology. We also study the calculus on $D^*(\mathcal{A})$ induced from one on a general Hopf algebra $\mathcal{A}$ in general and specialise to $D^*(G) = U(\mathfrak{g}) \bowtie k[G]$ as a noncommutative isometry group of an enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ as a noncommutative space.

1. INTRODUCTION

Coming out of the theory of quantum groups has emerged an approach to noncommutative geometry somewhat different from the operator algebras and K-theory one of Connes and others but with some points of contact with that as well as considerable contact with abstract Hopf algebra theory. The approach is based on building up the different layers of geometry: the differential structure, line bundles, frame bundles, etc. eventually arriving at spinors and a Dirac operator as naturally constructed and not axiomatically imposed as a definition of the geometry (as in Connes’ spectral triple theory).

This article has three goals. The first, covered in Section 2, is an exposition of the overall dictionary as well as the differences between the Hopf algebraic quantum groups approach and the more well-known operator algebras and K-theory one. We also discuss issues that appear to have led to confusion in the literature, notably the role of the Dirac operator. The quantum groups methods are very algebraically computable and hence should be interesting even to readers coming from the Connes spectral triple side of noncommutative geometry. In fact, the convergence and interaction between the two approaches is a very important recent development and we aim to bridge between them with our overview.

The second aim, in Sections 3, 4, is a self-contained demonstration of the starting point of the quantum groups approach, namely the classification of bicovariant differential calculi on Hopf algebras. We start with the seminal work of Woronowicz [33] for any Hopf algebra, which is mostly known to Hopf algebraists and is included mainly for completeness. We then explain our classification [22] for factorisable quantum groups and apply it to finite-dimensional Hopf algebras such as $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_2]$ at a cube root of unity. We also discuss several subtleties not so well

Date: 5/2002: resubmitted 1/2003.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58B32, 58B34, 20C05.

Key words and phrases. Quantum groups, quantum double, noncommutative geometry.

This paper is in final form and no version of it will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

known in the literature. Let us mention that in addition there are the Beggs–Majid classification theorem [4] for bicrossproduct quantum groups, see also [30], and the Majid–Oeckl twisting theorem [27] (which covers most triangular quantum groups), which altogether pretty much cover all classes of interest. In this way the first layer of geometry, choosing the differential structure, is more or less well understood in the quantum groups approach. The theory is interesting even for finite-dimensional Hopf algebras as ‘finite geometries’ as our example of $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_2]$ demonstrates.

Our third aim is to present some specific new results about differential calculi on quantum doubles. Section 5 applies the classification theorem of Section 4 to differential calculi on $D^*(\mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra and $D^*(\mathcal{A})$ is the dual of its Drinfeld double [11]. We demonstrate this on the nice example of the dual of the Drinfeld quantum double of a finite group, which is in fact a cross coproduct $kG \bowtie k(G)$. Even this case is interesting as we demonstrate for $G = S_3$, where we compute also its exterior algebra and cohomology. Section 6 looks at the general case of $D^*(\mathcal{A})$, where we show that a calculus on $\mathcal{A}$ extends in a natural way to one on the double, generalising the finite group case in [30]. The results also make sense for infinite-dimensional quantum doubles such as $D^*(G)$ in the form $U(g) \bowtie k[G]$ for an algebraic group of Lie type. We propose the general construction as a step towards a duality for quantum differentials inspired by T-duality in physics.

2. COMPARING THE K-THEORETIC AND QUANTUM GROUPS APPROACHES

A dictionary comparing the two approaches appears in Table 1, and let me say right away that we are not comparing like with like. The Connes K-theoretic approach is mathematically purer and has deeper theorems, while the quantum groups one is more organic and experience-led. Both approaches of course start with an algebra M , say with unit (to keep things simple), thought of as ‘functions’ but not necessarily commutative. The algebra plays the role of a topological space in view of the Gelfand–Naimark theorem. I suppose this idea goes back many decades to the birth of quantum mechanics. Integration of course is some kind of linear functional. In either approach it has to be made precise using analysis (and we do not discuss this here) but at a conceptual level there is also the question: which functional? The cyclic cohomology approach gives good motivation to take here an element of $HC^0(M)$, i.e. a trace functional as an axiom. We don’t have a good axiom in the quantum groups approach except when M is itself a quantum group, when translation invariance implies a unique one. In examples, it isn’t usually a trace. For other spaces we would hope that the geometry of the situation, such as a (quantum group) symmetry would give the natural choice. So here we already see a difference in scope and style of the approaches. Also, since we usually proceed algebraically in the quantum groups approach, we work over k a general field.

Next, also common, is the notion of ‘differential structure’ specified as an exterior algebra of differential forms Ω over M . An example is the universal differential calculus Ω_{univ} going back to algebraic topology, Hochschild cohomology etc. in the works of Quillen, Loday, Connes, Karoubi and others. Here

$$(1) \quad \Omega_{univ}^1 = \ker(\cdot), \quad df = f \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes f, \quad \forall f \in M,$$

where $\cdot : M \otimes M \rightarrow M$ is the product. Similarly for higher degrees. All other exterior algebras are quotients, so to classify the abstract possibilities for Ω as a

Classical	Connes approach	Quantum groups approach
topol. space integration differential calc. construction of : inner calculus top form	algebra M $\int : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, trace DGA $\Omega^\cdot$, d spe. triple $(\rho(M), \mathcal{H}, D)$ — impose cycle	algebra M $\int : M \rightarrow k$, symmetry bimodule $\Omega^1 \Rightarrow \text{DGA } \Omega^\cdot$ classify all by symmetry typ. $\exists \theta : d = [\theta, \cdot]$ typ. $\exists \text{ Top}$
principal bundle vector bundle connection Chern classes	— projective module $(\mathcal{E}, e)$ ∇ Chern – Connes pairing	$(P, \Omega^1(P), A, \Omega^1(A), \Delta_R)$ A quantum group fiber $\mathcal{E} = (P \otimes V)^A$, typ. $\exists e$ $\Omega^1(P) = \Omega_{hor}^1 \oplus \Omega_{ver}^1$ $\Leftrightarrow \omega : \Lambda^1(A) \rightarrow \Omega^1(P) \Rightarrow D_\omega$ —
frame bundle metric Levi – Civita Ricci tensor spin bundle Dirac operator Hodge star	— $ [D, M] \Rightarrow d(\psi, \phi)$ contained in D assumed $(D, \mathcal{H})$ in $ \cdot $ + orientation	princ. P + soldering $\Rightarrow \mathcal{E} \cong \Omega^1(M)$ $g \in \Omega^1 \otimes_M \Omega^1$; coframing D_ω + soldering $\Rightarrow \nabla_\omega$ $d\omega + \omega \wedge \omega \Rightarrow \text{Ricci}$ assoc. to frame bundle $(d, \gamma_a, \omega) \Rightarrow \not{D}$ $g, \text{ Top} \Rightarrow *$

TABLE 1. Two approaches to noncommutative geometry

differential graded algebra (DGA) we have to construct suitable differential graded ideals. This is the line taken in [8] and an idea explained there is to start with a spectral triple $(\rho(M), \mathcal{H}, D)$ as a representation of Ω_{univ}^1 , where d is represented by commutator with an operator D called ‘Dirac’, and then to divide by the kernel. This does *not* however, usually, impose enough constraints for a reasonable exterior algebra $\Omega(M)$, e.g. it is often not finite-dimensional over M , so one forces higher degrees to be zero, as well as additional relations with the aid of a cyclic cocycle of the desired top degree d corresponding to a ‘cycle’ $\int : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. For an orientation there is also a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading operator (trivial in the odd case) and a charge conjugation operator, and Connes requires a certain Hochschild cycle of degree d whose image in the spectral triple representation is the grading operator. This data together with the operator norm and a K-theoretic condition for Poincaré duality subsumes the role played in geometry by the usual Hodge $*$ operator and the volume form.

Here again the quantum groups approach is less ambitious and we don’t have a general construction. Instead we *classify all possible* $\Omega^1(M)$, typically restricted by some symmetry to make the problem manageable. We postpone $\Omega^2(M)$ and higher till later. Thus a first order calculus over M is a nice notion all by itself:

- An $M - M$ -bimodule Ω^1
- A linear map $d : M \rightarrow \Omega^1$ such that $d(fg) = (df)g + fdg$ for all $f, g \in M$ and such that the map $M \otimes M \rightarrow \Omega^1$ given by fdg is surjective.

It means classifying sub-bimodules of Ω_{univ}^1 to quotient by. In the last 5 years it was achieved on a case-by-case basis for all main classes of quantum groups and bicovariant calculi (see section 3). Then homogeneous spaces will likewise be constrained by smoothness of desired actions and hence inherit natural choices for

their calculi, and so on for an entire noncommutative universe of objects. Then we look at natural choices for $\Omega^2(M)$, $\Omega^3(M)$ etc. layer by layer and making choices only when needed. There is a key lemma[6] that if $\Omega^m(M)$ for $m \leq n$ are specified with d obeying $d^2 = 0$ then these have a maximal prolongation to higher degree, where we add in only those relations at higher degree implied by $d^2 = 0$ and Leibniz. And when M is a quantum group there is a canonical extension to all of $\Omega(M)$ due to [33] and the true meaning of which is Poincaré duality in the sense of a non-degenerate pairing between forms and skew-tensor fields. We will say more about this in Section 3.

Apart from these differences in style the two approaches are again broadly similar at the level of the differential forms and there is much scope for convergence. Let us note one difference in terminology. In the quantum groups approach we call a calculus ‘inner’ if there is a 1-form θ which generates d as graded commutator. This looks a lot like Connes ‘Dirac operator’ D in the spectral triple representation

$$(2) \quad \rho_D(df) = [D, \rho(f)]$$

but beware: our θ is a 1-form and nothing to do with the geometric Dirac operator $\not{D}$ that we construct only much later via gamma-matrices, spin connections etc. Moreover D in a spectral triple does *not* need to be in the image under the representation ρ_D of the space of 1-forms and should not be thought of as a one form.

The next layers of geometry require bundles. In the traditional approach to vector bundles coming from the theorems of Serre and Swan one thinks of these as finitely generated projective modules over M . However, in the quantum groups approach, as in differential geometry, we think that important vector bundles should really come as associated to principal ones. Principal bundles should surely have a quantum group fiber so this is the first place where the quantum group approach comes into its own. The Brzeziński-Majid theory of these is based on an algebra P (the ‘total space’), a quantum group coordinate algebra A , and *differential structures on them*, a coaction $\Delta_R : P \rightarrow P \otimes A$ such that $M = P^A$ and an exact sequence[7]

$$(3) \quad 0 \rightarrow P\Omega^1(M)P \rightarrow \Omega^1(P) \xrightarrow{\text{ver}} P \otimes \Lambda^1(A) \rightarrow 0$$

which expresses ‘local triviality’. Here $\Lambda^1(A)$ are the left-invariant differentials in $\Omega^1(A)$ and the map ver is the generator of the vertical vector fields. We require its kernel to be exactly the ‘horizontal’ forms pulled up from the base. In the geometrically less interesting case of the universal differential calculus the exactness of (3) is equivalent to a Hopf-Galois extension. A connection is a splitting of this sequence and characterised by a connection form ω . Of course, we have associated vector bundles $\mathcal{E} = (P \otimes V)^A$ for every A -comodule V , analogous to the usual geometric construction. A connection ω induces a covariant derivative D_ω with the ‘derivation-like’ property that one expects for an abstract covariant derivative ∇ , so the two approaches are compatible.

Just as the main example of the K-theory approach used to be the ‘noncommutative torus’ T_θ^2 [9], with vector bundles classified in [10], the main example for noncommutative bundles in the quantum groups approach was the q -monopole bundle[7] over the Podleś ‘noncommutative sphere’ S_q^2 . Probably the first nontrivial convergence between these approaches was in 1997 with the Hajac-Majid projector

e where [16]:

$$(4) \quad 1 - e = \begin{pmatrix} q^2(1 - b_3) & -qb_+ \\ b_- & b_3 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(S_q^2), \quad ede \cong D_\omega, \quad \langle [\tau], [e] \rangle = \tau(\text{Tr}(e)) = 1$$

where ω is the q -monopole connection and τ is the Masuda et al. trace on S_q^2 which had been found in [29]. The pairing is the Chern-Connes one between HC^0 and the class of e as an element of the K-group K_0 . We use the standard coordinates on S_q^2 namely with generators $b_\pm, b_3$ and relations

$$b_\pm b_3 = q^{\pm 2} b_3 b_\pm + (1 - q^{\pm 2}) b_\pm, \quad q^2 b_- b_+ = q^{-2} b_+ b_- + (q - q^{-1})(b_3 - 1)$$

$$(5) \quad b_3^2 = b_3 + qb_- b_+.$$

In this way one may exhibit the lowest charge monopole bundle $\mathcal{E}_1$ as a projective module. At the same time, since the Chern-Connes pairing is nonzero, it means that the q -monopole bundle is indeed nontrivial as expected. The computations in [16] are algebraic and, moreover, only for the universal differential calculus, but we see that matching up the two approaches is useful even at this level. This projector has sparked quite a bit of interest in recent years. Dabrowski and Landi looked for similar constructions and projectors for q -instantons, replacing complex numbers by quaternions. An inspired variant of that became the Connes-Landi projectors for twisted spheres S_θ^4 . In these cases the new idea is (as far as I understand) to work backwards from an ansatz for the form of projector to the forced commutation relations for those matrix entries as required by $e^2 = e$ and a desired pairing with cyclic cohomology. Note that, as twists, the noncommutative differential geometry of such examples is governed at the algebraic level by the Majid-Oeckl twisting theorem [27].

Finally, we come to the ‘top layer’ which is Riemannian geometry. In the approach of Connes this is all contained in the ‘Dirac operator’ D which was assumed at the outset as an axiom. In the quantum groups approach we have been building up the different layers and hope to construct a particular family of $\mathcal{D}$ reflecting all the choices of differential structure, spin connections etc. that we have made at lower levels. So the two approaches are going in opposite directions. In the table we show the quantum groups formulation of Riemannian geometry introduced in [23] and studied recently for finite sets [24], based on the notion of a quantum frame bundle. The main idea is a principal bundle (P, A, Δ_R) and an A -comodule V along with a ‘soldering form’ $\theta_V : V \rightarrow \Omega^1(P)$ that ensures that

$$(6) \quad \Omega^1(M) \cong \mathcal{E} = (P \otimes V)^A$$

i.e. that the cotangent bundle really can be identified as an associated bundle to the principal ‘frame’ one. It turns out that usual notions proceed independently of the choice of A , though what ω are possible and what ∇_ω they induce depends on the choice of A . Here $\nabla_\omega : \Omega^1(M) \rightarrow \Omega^1(M) \otimes_M \Omega^1(M)$ is D_ω mapped over under the soldering isomorphism. A certain $\bar{D}_\omega \wedge \theta_V$ corresponds similarly to its torsion tensor. In terms of ∇_ω the Riemann and torsion tensor are given by

$$(7) \quad \text{Riemann} = (\text{id} \wedge \nabla_\omega - d \otimes \text{id}) \nabla_\omega, \quad \text{Tor} = d - \nabla_\omega$$

as a 2-form valued operator on 1-forms and a map from 1-forms to 2-forms, respectively. For the Ricci tensor we need to lift the 2-form values of Riemann to

$\Omega^1(M) \otimes_M \Omega^1(M)$ in a way that splits the projection afforded by the wedge product, after which we can take a trace over Ω^1 . This is possible at least in some cases. This much is a ‘framed manifold’ with connection.

A *framed Riemannian manifold* needs in addition a nondegenerate tensor $g \in \Omega^1(M) \otimes \Omega^1(M)$, which is equivalent to a coframing $\theta_{V^*} : V^* \rightarrow \Omega^1(P)$ via

$$(8) \quad g = \langle \theta_V \otimes \theta_{V^*} \rangle_M,$$

where we pair by evaluating on the canonical element of $V \otimes V^*$, and θ_{V^*} is such that $\mathcal{E}^* \cong \Omega^1(M)$. Since $\mathcal{E}^*$ under the original framing is isomorphic to $\Omega^{-1}(M)$, such a coframing is the same as an isomorphism $\Omega^{-1}(M) \cong \Omega^1(M)$. The coframing point of view is nice because it points to a natural self-dual generalization of Riemannian geometry: instead of demanding zero torsion and $\nabla_\omega g = 0$ as one might usually do for a Levi-Civita connection, one can demand zero torsion and zero cotorsion (i.e. torsion with respect to θ_{V^*} as framing). The latter is a skew-version

$$(9) \quad (\nabla_\omega \wedge \text{id} - \text{id} \wedge \nabla_\omega)g = 0$$

of metric compatibility as explained in [23]. We can also demand symmetry, if we want, in the form

$$(10) \quad \wedge(g) = 0$$

and we can limit ourselves to θ_{V^*} built from θ_V induced by an A -invariant local metric $\eta \in V \otimes V$. Let us also note that if M is parallelizable we can frame with a trivial tensor product bundle and θ_V, θ_{V^*} reduce to a vielbein $e_V : V \hookrightarrow \Omega^1(M)$ and covielbein $e_{V^*} : V^* \hookrightarrow \Omega^1(M)$, i.e. subspaces forming left and right bases respectively over M and dual as A -comodules. A connection ω now reduces to a ‘Lie algebra-valued’ 1-form

$$(11) \quad \alpha : \Lambda^1(A) \rightarrow \Omega^1(M),$$

etc., in keeping with the local picture favoured by physicists. One has to solve for zero torsion and zero cotorsion in the form $\bar{D} \wedge e$ and $D \wedge e^* = 0$. At the time of writing the main noncommutative examples are when M is itself a quantum group. In the coquasitriangular case the dual of the space of invariant 1-forms forms a braided-Lie algebra [15], which comes with a braided-Killing form η . This provides a natural metric and in several examples one finds for it (by hand; a general theorem is lacking) that there is a unique associated generalised Levi-Civita connection in the sense above [24][25].

We are then able to take a different A -comodule W , say, for spinors. The associated bundle $\mathcal{S} = (P \otimes W)^A$ gets its induced covariant derivative from the spin connection ω on the principal bundle, and in many cases there is a reasonable choice of ‘gamma-matrices’ appropriate to the local metric η . We then define the Dirac operator from these objects much as usual. By now the approach is somewhat different from the Connes one and we do *not* typically obtain something obeying the axioms for D . This seems the case even for finite groups [24] as well as for q -quantum groups [25]. The fundamental reason is perhaps buried in the very notion of vector field: in the parallelizable case an M -basis $\{e_a\}$ of $\Omega^1(M)$ implies ‘partial derivatives’ ∂^a defined by $df = \sum_a e_a \partial^a(f)$. These are not usually derivations but more typically ‘braided derivations’ (e.g. on a quantum group this is shown in [22]). In cases such as the noncommutative torus one has in fact ordinary derivations around. The noncommutative differential calculus is a twist so that

the constructions look close to classical. But for q -examples and even finite group examples, this is not at all the case. Perhaps this is at the root of the mismatch and may stimulate a way to fix the problem.

Also in the presence of a metric we obtain a Hodge $*$ operator $\Omega^m \rightarrow \Omega^{d-m}$ where d is the ‘volume dimension’ or degree of the top (volume) form, assuming of course that it exists. Once we have this we can write down actions such as $-\frac{1}{4}F \wedge *F$ etc where $F = d\alpha$ is the curvature of $\alpha \in \Omega^1$ modulo exact forms (Maxwell theory) or $F = d\alpha + \alpha \wedge \alpha$ is the curvature of α viewed modulo gauge transformation by invertible functions (this is $U(1)$ -Yang-Mills theory). Integration and the Hodge $*$ thus play the role of the operator norm $\| \cdot \|$ in the Connes approach. The two approaches were compared in a simple model in [28]. In principle one should be able to extend these ideas to the non-Abelian gauge theory on bundles as well, to construct a variety of Lagrangian-based models.

3. CLASSIFYING CALCULI ON GENERAL HOPF ALGEBRAS

We now focus for the rest of the paper on a small part of the quantum groups approach discussed above, namely just the differential calculus, and for the most part just Ω^1 . In this section we let $M = A$ be a Hopf algebra over a field k . Following Woronowicz[33], a differential structure is bicovariant if:

- Ω^1 is a bicomodule with $\Delta_L : \Omega^1 \rightarrow A \otimes \Omega^1$ and $\Delta_R : \Omega^1 \rightarrow \Omega^1 \otimes A$ bimodule maps.
- d is a bicomodule map.

Here a Hopf algebra means a coproduct $\Delta : A \rightarrow A \otimes A$, a counit $\epsilon : A \rightarrow k$ and an antipode $S : A \rightarrow A$ such that A is a coalgebra, Δ an algebra map etc. [20, 26]. Coalgebras and (bi)comodules are defined in the same way as algebras and (bi)modules but with the directions of structure maps reversed. In the bicovariance condition A is itself a bi(co)module via the (co)product and $\Omega^1 \otimes A, A \otimes \Omega^1$ have the tensor product (bi)module structure. The second condition in particular fully determines Δ_L, Δ_R by compatibility with Δ , so a bicovariant calculus means precisely one where left and right translation expressed by Δ extend consistently to Ω^1 . The universal calculus $\Omega_{univ}^1 \subset A \otimes A$ is bicovariant with coactions the tensor product of the regular coactions defined by the coproduct on each copy of A .

The result in [33] is that Ω^1 in the bicovariant case is fully determined by the subspace Λ^1 of (say) Δ_L -invariant 1-forms. Indeed, there is a standard bi(co)module isomorphism

$$(12) \quad A \otimes A \cong A \otimes A, \quad a \otimes b \mapsto a \Delta b$$

under which $\Omega_{univ}^1 \cong A \otimes A^+$, where $A^+ = \ker \epsilon$ is the augmentation ideal or kernel of the counit (classically it would be the functions vanishing at the group identity). The bimodule structure on the right hand side of (12) is left multiplication in the first A from the left and the tensor product of two right multiplications from the right. The bicomodule structure is the left coproduct on the first A from the left and the tensor product of right comultiplication and the right quantum adjoint coaction from the right. Hence we arrive at the classic result:

Proposition 3.1. (*Woronowicz*) *Bicovariant Ω^1 are in 1-1 correspondence with quotient objects Λ^1 of A^+ as an A -crossed module under right multiplication and the right quantum adjoint coaction.*

We recall that an A -crossed module means a vector space which is both an A -module and a compatible A -comodule; the compatibility conditions are due to Radford and correspond in the finite-dimensional case to a module of the Drinfeld double $D(A) = A^{*\text{op}} \bowtie A$ when we view a right coaction of A as a right action of $A^{*\text{op}}$ by evaluation. Given the crossed module Λ^1 we define $\Omega^1 = A \otimes \Lambda^1$ with the regular left(co)modules and the tensor product (co)actions from the right. Because the category is prebraided, there is a Yang-Baxter operator $\Psi = \Psi_{\Lambda^1, \Lambda^1} : \Lambda^1 \otimes \Lambda^1 \rightarrow \Lambda^1 \otimes \Lambda^1$ which is invertible when A has bijective antipode. One has the same results for right-invariant 1-forms $\bar{\Lambda}^1$ with $\Omega = \bar{\Lambda}^1 \otimes A$.

Finally we recall that in the quantum groups approach we only need to classify Ω^1 because, at least for a bicovariant calculus, there is a natural extension to an entire exterior algebra $\Omega = A \otimes \Lambda$ (where Λ is the algebra of left-invariant differential forms). There is a d operation obeying $d^2 = 0$ i.e. we have an entire DGA. The construction in [33] is a quotient of the tensor algebra over A ,

$$(13) \quad \Omega = T_A(\Omega^1) / \oplus_n \ker A_n, \quad A_n = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{l(\sigma)} \Psi_{i_1} \cdots \Psi_{i_{l(\sigma)}}$$

where $\Psi_i \equiv \Psi_{i, i+1}$ denotes a certain braiding $\Psi : \Omega^1 \otimes_A \Omega^1 \rightarrow \Omega^1 \otimes_A \Omega^1$ acting in the $i, i+1$ place of $(\Omega^1)^{\otimes_n^A}$ and $\sigma = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{l(\sigma)}}$ is a reduced expression in terms of simple reflections. This turns out to be equivalent to defining Λ directly as the tensor algebra of Λ^1 over k with A_n defined similarly by $\Psi_{\Lambda^1, \Lambda^1}$ above. As such, Λ is manifestly a braided group or Hopf algebra in a braided category of the linear braided space type [20]. Similarly Λ^* starting from the tensor algebra of Λ^{1*} is a braided group, dually paired with Λ . The relations in (13) can be interpreted as the minimal such that this pairing is nondegenerate, which is a version of Poincaré duality. Also, Λ being a braided group means among other things that if there is a top form (an integral element) then it is unique, which defines an ‘epsilon tensor’ by the coefficient of the top form. This combines with a metric to form a Hodge $*$ operator as mentioned in Section 2. More details and an application to Schubert calculus on flag varieties are in our companion paper in this volume.

4. CLASSIFICATION ON COQUASITRIANGULAR HOPF ALGEBRAS

After Woronowicz’s 1989 work for any Hopf algebra, the next general classification result is my result for factorisable coquasitriangular Hopf algebras such as appropriate versions of the coordinate algebras $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ of the Drinfeld-Jimbo quantum groups, presented in Goslar, July 1996 [21, 22]. We start with the finite-dimensional theory which is our main interest for later sections, e.g. the above quantum groups at q a primitive odd root of unity. We recall that a Hopf algebra H is quasitriangular if there is a ‘universal R-matrix’ $\mathcal{R} \in H \otimes H$ obeying certain axioms (due to Drinfeld). It is factorisable if $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R}$ is nondegenerate when viewed as a linear map from the dual. The dual notion to quasitriangular is coquasitriangular in the sense of a functional $\mathcal{R}$ on the tensor square, a notion which works well in the infinite-dimensional case also [20].

Theorem 4.1. (*Majid*) *Let A be a finite-dimensional factorisable coquasitriangular Hopf algebra with dual H . Bicovariant $\Omega^1(A)$ are in 1-1 correspondence with two-sided ideals of H^+ .*

Proof. This is [22, Prop. 4.2] which states that the required action of the quantum double on $\Lambda^{1*} \subset H^+$ under the quantum Killing form isomorphism $\mathcal{Q} : A^+ \rightarrow H^+$ is

the left and right coregular representation of two copies of H on A^+ (the coregular action of H on A is obviously adjoint to the regular action of H on H if we wish to phrase it explicitly in terms of H , i.e. Λ^1 is isomorphic to a quotient of H^+ by a 2-sided ideal). $\diamond$

As far as the actual proof in [22] is concerned, there were two ideas. First of all, instead of classifying quotients Λ^1 of A^+ it is convenient to classify their duals or ‘quantum tangent spaces’ as subcrossed modules $\mathcal{L} \subset H^+$. For coirreducible calculi (ones with no proper quotients) we want irreducible $\mathcal{L}$, but we can also classify indecomposable ones, etc. Of course an A -crossed module can be formulated as an H -crossed module (the roles of action and coaction are swapped) or $D(H)$ -module, so actually we arrive at a self-contained classification for quantum tangent spaces for any Hopf algebra H . One has to dualise back (as above) to get back to the left-invariant 1-forms. The second idea was that when H is factorisable the quantum Killing form is a nondegenerate map $\mathcal{Q} : A^+ \rightarrow H^+$ and, moreover, $D(H) \cong H \blacktriangleright H$, which as an algebra is a tensor product $H \otimes H$. We refer to [20] where the forward direction of the isomorphism was proven for the first time. So the crossed module structures $\mathcal{L} \subset H^+$ that we must classify become submodules of A^+ under the action of H from the left and the right (viewed as left via S), which we computed as the left and right coregular ones. Converting back to Λ^1 means of course 2-sided ideals as stated.

At present we are interested in the finite-dimensional case where we need only the algebraic theorem as above. Note that every Artinian algebra has a unique block decomposition, which includes all finite-dimensional algebras H over a field k . The decomposition is equivalent to finding a set of orthogonal centrally primitive idempotents e_i with

$$(14) \quad 1 = \sum_i e_i.$$

These generate ideals $e_i H$. Note that $e_i^2 = e_i$ implies that $\epsilon(e_i) = 0, 1$ and the above implies that exactly one is nonzero. Similarly $H^+ = \oplus_i e_i H^+$ is a decomposition of H^+ . Hence

$$(15) \quad \Omega_{univ}^1 \cong \oplus_i \Omega_{e_i}^1$$

where, for any central projector e we have a calculus

$$(16) \quad \Omega_e^1 = A \otimes \Lambda_e^1, \quad \Lambda_e^1 = e H^+.$$

We build the left-invariant 1-forms directly on the block as isomorphic to H^+ modulo the kernel of multiplication by e . In these terms (tracing through the details of the classification theorem[22]) we have explicitly:

$$(17) \quad (eh).a = \sum a_{(1)} e \mathcal{R}_2(a_{(2)}) h \mathcal{R}_1(a_{(3)}), \quad da = \sum a_{(1)} e \mathcal{Q}_1(a_{(2)}) - ae; \quad \theta = e$$

(the calculus here is inner). We use the Sweedler notation $\Delta a = \sum a_{(1)} \otimes a_{(2)}$ and the notation from [20] where $\mathcal{R}_1(a) = (a \otimes \text{id})(\mathcal{R})$ etc. Since $\mathcal{R}_1$ is an algebra map and $\mathcal{R}_2$ an antialgebra map, one may easily verify that this defines a bimodule and that the Leibniz rule is obeyed. These formulae generalise ones given usually in terms of R-matrices. One has, cf. [22]:

Corollary 4.2. (*Majid*) *In the finite-dimensional semisimple case, coirreducible bicovariant calculi on A in the setting of Theorem 4.1 are in 1-1 correspondence with*

nontrivial irreducible representations of the dual Hopf algebra H . The dimension of the calculus is the square of the dimension of the corresponding representation.

Proof. Indeed, in the case of H finite-dimensional semisimple, each block will be a matrix block corresponding to an irreducible representation. In this case among the projectors there will be exactly one where $eh = e\epsilon(h)$ for all $h \in H$ (the normalized unimodular integral). It has counit 1 and corresponds to the trivial representation; we exclude it in view of $eH^+ = 0$. $\diamond$

This semisimple case is the situation covered in [22] in the form of an assumed Peter-Weyl decomposition. We will apply it to the quantum double example in the next section. Moreover, for each irreducible representation, one may write (17) in terms of the matrix R given by $\mathcal{R}$ in the representation. In this case one has formulae first used by Jurco[18] for the construction of bicovariant calculi on the standard quantum groups such as $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_n]$. That is not our context at the moment but we make some remarks about it at the end of the section. Let us note only that at the time they appeared such results in [22] were the first of any kind to identify the full moduli of all coirreducible bicovariant calculi in some setting with irreducible representations.

In the nonsemisimple case the algebra H has a nontrivial Jacobson radical J defined as the intersection of all its maximal 2-sided ideals. It lies in H^+ . Hence by Theorem 4.1 there is a calculus

$$(18) \quad \Omega_{ss}^1 = A \otimes H^+ / J$$

which we call the ‘semisimple quotient’ of the universal calculus. H/J has a decomposition into matrix blocks giving a decomposition of Ω_{ss}^1 along the lines of the semisimple case.

Example 4.3. Let $\mathbb{C}_q^{\text{red}}[SL_2]$ be the 27-dimensional reduced quantum group at q a primitive cube root of unity. Here

$$a^3 = d^3 = 1, \quad b^3 = c^3 = 0$$

in terms of the usual generators. The enveloping Hopf algebra $u_q(sl_2)$ is known to have the block decomposition

$$u_q(sl_2) = M_3(\mathbb{C}) \oplus B$$

where B is an 18-dimensional non-matrix block (the algebra is not semisimple) with central projection of counit 1. Hence the universal calculus decomposes into nontrivial calculi of dimensions 9, 17. Moreover, $J \subset B$ is 13-dimensional and the quotient

$$B/J = \mathbb{C} \oplus M_2(\mathbb{C})$$

implies a 4-dimensional calculus as a quotient of the 17-dimensional one (the other summand $\mathbb{C}$ gives zero). Here Ω_{ss}^1 is the direct sum of the 4 and 9 dimensional matrix calculi.

The natural choice of calculus here is 4-dimensional and has the same form as the lowest dimension calculus for generic q , the 4D one first found by hand by Woronowicz[33]. For roots of unity the cohomology and entire geometry are, however, completely different from the generic or real q case as shown in [14]. This takes $\mathbb{C}_q^{\text{red}}[SL_2]$ at 3, 5, 7-th roots as a finite geometry where all computations can be done and all ideas explored completely. We find, for example, the Hodge $*$ operator for the natural q -metric, and show that the moduli space of solutions of Maxwell’s

equations without sources or ‘self-propagating electromagnetic modes’ decomposes into a direct sum

$$\{\text{Maxwell zero modes}\} = \{\text{zero – curvature}\} \oplus \{\text{self – dual}\} \oplus \{\text{anti – selfdual}\}$$

of topological (cohomology) modes, self-dual and anti-selfdual ones. The noncommutative de Rham cohomology here in each degree has the same dimension as the space of left-invariant forms, for reasons that are mysterious. We also find that the number of self-dual plus zero curvature modes appears to coincide with the number of harmonic 1-form modes. We find in general that the reduced $\mathbb{C}_q^{\text{red}}[SL_2]$, although finite dimensional and totally algebraic, behaves geometrically like a ‘noncompact’ manifold apparently linked to the nonsemisimplicity of $u_q(sl_2)$. Also interesting is the Riemannian geometry of the reduced $\mathbb{C}_q^{\text{red}}[SL_2]$ in [25]. The Ricci tensor for the same q -metric turns out to be essentially proportional to the metric itself, i.e. an ‘Einstein space’. It would also be interesting to look at the differential geometry induced by taking the other blocks according to our classification theorem, particularly the non-matrix block.

Finally, let us go back and comment on the situation for the usual (not reduced) q -deformation quantum groups $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ associated to simple Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$. There are two versions of interest, Drinfeld’s deformation-theoretic formal powerseries setting over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ where $q = e^{\frac{\hbar}{2}}$, and the algebraic fixed q setting. The first is easier and we can adapt the proof of Theorem 4.1 immediately to it [22]. Here $H = U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $A = U_q(\mathfrak{g})'$ is its topological dual Hopf algebra rather than the more usual coordinate algebra (the main difference is that some of its generators have logarithms).

Proposition 4.4. (*Majid*) *In the formal powerseries setting over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$, bicovariant Ω^1 on the dual of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ are in 1-1 correspondence with 2-sided ideals in $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]^+$.*

Proof. In fact the key point of Drinfeld’s formulation [11] is that one has a category of deformation Hopf algebras with all the axioms of usual Hopf algebra including duality holding over the ring $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ and the additional axioms of a quasitriangular structure holding in particular for his version of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. The arguments in the proof of [22, Prop. 4.2] and Theorem 4.1, as outlined above, require only these general axiomatic properties and take the same form line by line in the Drinfeld setting. Thus, the map $\mathcal{Q}$ has the same intertwiner properties used to convert an ad-stable right ideal in the dual to a 2-sided ideal in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. That $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ are indeed factorizable (so that $\mathcal{Q}$ is an isomorphism) when we use the topological dual is the Reshetikhin-Semenov-Tian-Shanksy theorem [31]. Its underlying reason is visible at the level of the subquantum groups $U_q(b_{\pm})$ where $U_q(b_{\pm})' \cong U_q(b_{\mp})$ was shown by Drinfeld in [11], which combines with the triangular decomposition of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ to yield factorisability. Finally, also due to Drinfeld, is that $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cong U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$ as algebras (since given by a coproduct-twist of the latter as a quasiHopf algebra [12]). Hence two sided ideals in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^+$ are in correspondence with 2-sided ideals in the undeformed $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]^+$. $\diamond$

This reduces the classification of calculi to a classical question about the undeformed algebra $U(\mathfrak{g})[[\hbar]]$. The natural two-sided ideals of interest here are those given by two-ideals from $U(\mathfrak{g})$ as a Hopf algebra over $\mathbb{C}$. Let us call these ideals of ‘classical type’ and likewise the corresponding calculi ‘of classical type’. We are interested in those contained in $U(\mathfrak{g})^+$ and which are cofinite so that the corresponding calculi are finite-dimensional (f.d.). Maximal such ideals correspond to

coirreducible calculi. Maximal cofinite ideals of $U(\mathfrak{g})$, as for any algebra over a field, correspond (via the kernel) to its finite-dimensional irreducible representations and hence to such representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ as a Lie algebra. Intersection with $U(\mathfrak{g})^+$ gives corresponding ideals which are maximal there, and for a proper ideal we drop the trivial representation. The correspondence here uses the central character to separate maximal ideals in one direction, and the annihilator of the quotient of $U(\mathfrak{g})^+$ by the ideal in the other direction. Hence Proposition 4.4 has the corollary

$$(19) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{coirreducible classical - type} \\ \text{f.d. bicovariant calculi on } U_q(\mathfrak{g})' \end{array} \right\} \leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nontrivial f.d. irreducible} \\ \text{representations of } \mathfrak{g} \end{array} \right\}$$

which is in the same spirit as Corollary 4.2. Let us note that when one speaks of representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in the deformation setting one usually has in mind ones similarly of classical-type deforming ones of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (so that one speaks of an equivalence of categories). On the other hand, without a detailed study of the Peter-Weyl decomposition for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in the $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ setting, we do not claim that the universal calculus decomposes into a direct sum of these calculi, which would be the full-strength version of the theory in [22] (as explained there).

The classification for the $q \in \mathbb{C}$ case with $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ algebraic is more complicated and shows a different ‘orthogonal’ kind of phenomenon. Here one finds, as well as one calculus for each finite-dimensional irreducible representation (in the spirit of (19)), further ‘twisted variants’ of the same square dimension. This possibility was mentioned in [22] and attributed to the fact that in this case the Hopf algebra is not quite factorisable. Points of view differ on the significance of these additional twists but our own is the following. First of all, one can guess that the calculi that fit with the $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ analysis above should correspond in the algebraic setting to calculi which are commutative as $q \rightarrow 1$, while the ‘twisted variants’ should not have this property and hence could be considered as pathological from a deformation-theoretic point of view. As evidence, we demonstrate this below for $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_n]$. Moreover, this is a pathology that exists for most R-matrix constructions, not only calculi. Indeed, we already explained in [19, 20] that to fit with Hopf algebra theory R-matrices must be normalised in the ‘quantum group normalisation’. For $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_n]$ let R_{hecke} be in the usual Hecke normalisation where the braiding has eigenvalues $q, -q^{-1}$. Then the correct quantum group normalisation is

$$(20) \quad R = q^{-\frac{1}{n}} R_{hecke}$$

and we explained that one has the ambiguity of the choice of n -th root. The Jurco construction for the n^2 -squared calculus was given entirely in terms of R-matrices (we give some explicit formulae in Section 5) so one has an n -fold ambiguity for the choice of $q^{-\frac{1}{n}}$. The unique choice compatible with the $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ point of view is the principal root that tends to 1 as $q \rightarrow 1$. The other choices differ by n -th root of unity factors in the normalisation and thereby in all formulae and these are the ‘additional twists’. Similarly in the contragredient and other representations. This reproduces exactly what was found for the specific analysis of calculi on $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_n]$ of dimension n^2 in [32] (note, however, that this was not a classification of all calculi in the sense above since the dimension was fixed at n^2 or less). It was found that for $n > 2$ there were $2n$ calculi labelled by $\pm$ and z a primitive n th root of unity (or just the parameter z if $n = 2$). As remarked already in [32], only the $z = 1$ cases have a commutative limit as $q \rightarrow 1$ and we identify them now as the canonical choices for the fundamental and conjugate fundamental representations (these being identified

if $n = 2$). One can also view this at the level of the universal R-matrix for all representations as a variation of $\mathcal{R}$.

Following [22] (their preprint appeared several months after [22] was archived), Bauman and Schmidt[3] studied the classification for $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ using the same factorizability method as above. This is a more formal treatment but not a complete analysis of the possible twists any more than [22] was. Meanwhile, about a year after [22], Heckenberger and Schmüdgen[17] gave a full classification for certain but not all $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ using a different method, which appears to be the current state of play.

5. DIFFERENTIALS ON THE QUANTUM CODOUBLE OF A FINITE GROUP.

In this section we are going to demonstrate the classification theorem in the previous section for the most famous factorisable coquasitriangular Hopf algebra of all, namely the coordinate algebra of the Drinfeld quantum double itself. So $A = D^*(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{H}^{cop} \blacktriangleright \mathcal{A}$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite dimensional Hopf algebra and $\mathcal{H}$ is its dual. As an algebra the codouble is a tensor product but we are interested in bicovariant calculi on it, which depends on the doubly-twisted coproduct. By our theorem, these are classified by two-sided ideals in $D(\mathcal{H})$. Actually, we compute only the case where $\mathcal{A} = k(G)$, the functions on a finite group G , but the methods apply more generally. Then $A = kG \blacktriangleright k(G)$. We assume k is of characteristic zero.

Theorem 5.1. *Differential calculi on $D^*(G) = kG \blacktriangleright k(G)$ are classified by pairs $(\mathcal{C}, V)$ where $\mathcal{C} \subset G$ is a conjugacy class and V is an irreducible representation of the centralizer, and at least one of $\mathcal{C}, V$ are nontrivial. The calculus has dimension $|\mathcal{C}|^2 \dim(V)^2$.*

Proof. Here $H = D(G) = k(G) \blacktriangleright kG$ is a semidirect product by the adjoint action. Taking basis $\{\delta_s \otimes u \mid s, u \in G\}$, the product is $(\delta_s \otimes u)(\delta_t \otimes v) = \delta_{s, utu^{-1}}(\delta_s \otimes uv)$. Consider an element of the form $e = \sum_s \delta_s \otimes e_s$ where $e_s \in kG$. To be central, we consider

$$\delta_t \cdot e = \delta_t \otimes e_t, \quad e \cdot \delta_t = \sum_s \delta_s \delta_{Ad_{e_s}(t)} \otimes e_s.$$

Writing $e_s = \sum_u e_{s,u} u$, say, equality requires

$$e_{t,u} \delta_t = e_{utu^{-1},u} \delta_{utu^{-1}}, \quad \forall t, u \in G.$$

This implies that $e_s \in kG_s$ the group algebra of the centralizer of s in G . Next, $u \cdot e = e \cdot u$ requires that $e_{usu^{-1}} = u e_s u^{-1}$ for all $u, s \in G$. Thus central elements e are of the form

$$(21) \quad e = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{C}} \delta_s \otimes e_s, \quad e_s \in kG_s, \quad u e_s u^{-1} = e_{usu^{-1}}, \quad \forall u \in G$$

for some Ad-stable subset $\mathcal{C} \subset G$. In that case one may compute $e^2 = \sum_s \delta_s \otimes e_s^2$. Hence projectors are precisely of the above form with each e_s a central idempotent of kG_s . For a centrally primitive idempotent we need $\mathcal{C}$ a conjugacy class and a centrally primitive idempotent e_0 on the group algebra of the centralizer G_0 (any one point $s_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ determines the rest). The choice of e_0 comes from the block decomposition of kG_0 and in characteristic zero this is given by irreducible representations V . The relation is

$$(22) \quad e_0 = \frac{\dim(V)}{|G_0|} \sum_{u \in G_0} \text{tr}_V(u^{-1}) u.$$

This gives the block decomposition of $D(G)$. For $D(G)^+$ we remove the trivial case.

◇

Note that this result is exactly in line with Corollary 4.2 since the result is the same data as for the classification of irreducible representations of $D(G)$, which are also the same as irreducible crossed G -modules. This is to be expected as $D(G)$ is semisimple because the square of its antipode is the identity. Let $\{e_i\}$ be a basis of V and $\mathcal{C} = \{a, b, c, \dots\}$. Note also that $\mathcal{C}$ is just the data for a calculus $\Omega^1(k(G))$ on a finite group function algebra, while V is just the data for a calculus $\Omega^1(kG_0)$ on a finite group algebra viewed ‘up side down’ as a noncommutative space, a result in [22]. The calculus on the double glues together these calculi. We now obtain explicit formulae as follows.

Given the data above, the associated representation W of $D(G)$ has basis $\{e_{ai}\}$ say, with action

$$\delta_s \cdot e_{ai} = \delta_{s,a} e_{ai}, \quad u \cdot e_{ai} = \sum_j e_{uau^{-1}j} \zeta_a(u)^j{}_i,$$

where $\zeta : \mathcal{C} \times G \rightarrow G_0$ is a cocycle

$$(23) \quad \zeta_a(u) = g_{ua}^{-1} u g_a; \quad \zeta_a(uv) = \zeta_{vav^{-1}}(u) \zeta_a(v)$$

defined by any section map $g : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow G$ such that $g_a s_0 g_a^{-1} = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{C}$, and we use its matrix in the representation V . Completely in terms of matrices, we have the representation of $D(G)$ by

$$(24) \quad \rho(\delta_s \otimes u)^{ai}{}_{bj} = \delta_{s,a} \delta_{u^{-1}au, b} \zeta_b(u)^i{}_j.$$

We also need the universal R-matrix and quantum Killing form

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{R} = \sum_{u \in G} \delta_u \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes u, \quad \mathcal{Q} = \sum_{u, v} \delta_{uvu^{-1}} \otimes u \otimes \delta_u \otimes v$$

of $D(G)$. Finally, we need the Hopf algebra structure of $A = kG \bowtie k(G) = \{s \otimes \delta_u \mid s, u \in G\}$ with coproduct

$$(26) \quad \Delta \delta_u = \sum_{vw=u} \delta_v \otimes \delta_w, \quad \Delta s = \sum_u s \delta_u \otimes u^{-1} s u$$

and s, δ_u commuting.

We insert these formulae into the Jurco-type construction for a representation (ρ, W) and the conventions of [22]. One can do it either for left-invariant forms Λ as elsewhere in the paper, or, which gives nicer results for our present conventions for $D^*(G)$, we can do it for right invariant forms $\bar{\Lambda}^1$. In this case we define $\bar{\Lambda}^1 = \text{End}(W)$ with basis $\{e_\alpha^\beta\}$ and use the standard formulae for quasitriangular Hopf algebras, cf. Section 4:

$$\Omega^1 = \text{End}(W) \otimes A, \quad a \cdot e_\alpha^\beta = \sum \rho(\mathcal{R}_1(a_{(1)}))^\gamma{}_\alpha e_\gamma^\delta \rho(\mathcal{R}_2(a_{(2)}))^\beta{}_\delta a_{(3)}$$

$$(27) \quad da = \sum \rho(\mathcal{Q}_2(a_{(1)})) a_{(2)} - \theta a, \quad \forall a \in A; \quad \theta = \sum_\alpha e_\alpha^\alpha,$$

where $\rho(h) = \rho(h)^\alpha{}_\beta e_\alpha^\beta$ and summations of indices are understood. Putting in the explicit formulae (24)–(26) we have basis $\{e_{ai}{}^{bj}\}$ say, and find

$$\Omega^1 = \text{End}(W) \cdot D^*(G), \quad f e_{ai}{}^{bj} = e_{ai}{}^{bj} L_b(f), \quad df = \sum_{a,i} e_{ai}{}^{ai} \partial_a(f)$$

$$(28) \quad se_{ai}^{bj} = \sum_k e_{sas^{-1}k}^{bj} \zeta_a(s)^k b^{-1}sb, \quad ds = \sum_{a,i,j} e_{sas^{-1}i}^{aj} \zeta_a(s)^i_j a^{-1}sa - \theta s$$

for all $s \in G, f \in k(G)$. Here $\partial_a = L_a - \text{id}$, where $L_a(f) = f(a(\))$ denotes left-translation in the direction of a and $\theta = \sum_{ai} e_{ai}^{ai}$ makes the calculus inner. The special case where we take the trivial representation of the centralizer is a canonical calculus of dimension $|\mathcal{C}|^2$ associated to any conjugacy class, cf. some similar formulae from a different point of view (viewing the double as a bicrossproduct) in [30].

Example 5.2. For S_3 with $u = (12), v = (23), w = (13)$, the possible conjugacy classes are $\{e\}, \{uv, vu\}, \{u, v, w\}$ of orders 1, 2, 3. Their centralizers are $S_3, \mathbb{Z}_3, \mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence on $D^*(S_3)$ we have calculi of dimension 1, 4 for the first class (the nontrivial irreducibles of S_3), three calculi of dimension 4 (the three irreducibles of $\mathbb{Z}_3$) for the second class and two of dimension 9 (the two irreducibles of $\mathbb{Z}_2$) for the third class.

Of these, we now focus on the 9-dimensional calculus since the associated conjugacy class of order 3 defines the usual differential calculus on S_3 and the $D^*(S_3)$ calculus is an extension of that. As basepoint we take $s_0 = u$ and as section we take $g_u = e, g_v = w, g_w = v$. We let $q = \pm 1$ according to the trivial or nontrivial representation of $\mathbb{Z}_2$. The resulting cocycle as a function on S_3 is

$$(29) \quad \begin{array}{c|cccccc} S_3 & 1 & u & v & w & uv & vu \\ \hline \zeta_u & 1 & q & 1 & 1 & q & q \\ \zeta_v & 1 & q & q & 1 & 1 & q \\ \zeta_w & 1 & q & 1 & q & q & 1 \end{array}$$

For the calculus, we obtain from the above that $df = \sum_a e_a \partial_a(f)$ is the usual calculus on S_3 with $e_a \equiv e_a^a$, and

$$(30) \quad du = q(e_u u + e_w^v w + e_v^w v) - \theta u, \quad dv = e_u^w u + qe_v v + e_w^u w - \theta v$$

and the same with v, w interchanged in the second expression. Here $\theta = e_u + e_v + e_w$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} d(uv) &= (qe_u^w + qe_v^u + e_w^v)vu - \theta uv \\ d(vu) &= (qe_u^v + e_v^w + qe_w^u)uv - \theta vu. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, it is enough to work with generators u, v say of S_3 using the commutation relations from (28), namely

$$(31) \quad ue_a^b = qe_{uau}^b bub, \quad ve_u^b = e_w^b bvb, \quad ve_v^b = qe_v^b bvb, \quad ve_w^b = e_u^b bvb.$$

Finally, for physics, we also need the higher exterior algebra as explained in Section 3. For coquasitriangular Hopf algebras and in the present right-invariant conventions we have the standard braiding

$$(32) \quad \Psi(e_\alpha^\beta \otimes e_\gamma^\delta) = e_\mu^\nu \otimes e_\sigma^\tau (R^{-1})^{\alpha_1}_{\alpha}{}^\mu{}_{\alpha_2} R^{\beta}_{\alpha_3}{}^{\alpha_2}{}_{\gamma} R^{\delta}_{\alpha_4}{}^{\alpha_3}{}_{\tau} \tilde{R}^{\alpha_4}_{\nu}{}^\sigma{}_{\alpha_1}$$

where $R = (\rho \otimes \rho)(\mathcal{R})$ and $\tilde{R} = (\rho \otimes \rho \circ S)(\mathcal{R})$. This is adjoint to the braided-matrix relations of the braided matrices $B(R)$, i.e. $\bar{\Lambda}^{1*}$ is a standard matrix braided Lie algebra[15]. We can compute this braiding explicitly for $D^*(G)$ above to find:

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} &\Psi(e_{ai}^{bj} \otimes e_{ck}^{dl}) \\ &= e_{a^{-1}bcb^{-1}am}^{dl} \zeta_c(a^{-1}b)^m{}_k \otimes \zeta_b^{-1}(d^{-1})^j{}_p e_{d^{-1}adn}^{d^{-1}bdp} \zeta_a(d^{-1})^n{}_i \end{aligned}$$

where we sum over the matrix indices m, n, p of the representation of the centralizer group. The relations of the exterior algebra are then computed using braided-factorial matrices [20].

Then for our example $D^*(S_3)$ with the standard order 3 conjugacy class and either representation $q = \pm 1$ of the isotropy group $\mathbb{Z}_2$, we have dimensions and cohomology in low degree:

$$\dim(\Omega(D^*(S_3))) = 1 : 9 : 48 : 198 : \dots,$$

$$(34) \quad H^0(D^*(S_3)) = k.1, \quad H^1(D^*(S_3)) = k.\theta$$

which is the same as for an isomorphic bicrossproduct example computed in [30]. We expect the exterior algebra to be finite-dimensional and the Hilbert series to have a symmetric form (our computer did not have enough memory for further degrees to check this). The exterior algebra appears to be quadratic with the relations in degree 2 from (33) as follows. For simplicity we state them only for $q = 1$:

$$e_a^b \wedge e_{aba^{-1}}^b = 0, \quad (e_{aba^{-1}}^a)^2 + \{e_a^a, e_b^a\} = 0, \quad \forall a, b$$

$$(35) \quad e_u \wedge e_v + e_v \wedge e_w + e_w \wedge e_u = 0$$

and the conjugate (product-reversal) of this. Here $e_a \equiv e_a^a$ obey $e_a^2 = 0$ and we recover precisely the usual $\Omega(S_3)$ as a subalgebra generated by them. In addition, we have

$$e_u^v \wedge e_v^u + e_v^w \wedge e_w^v + e_w^u \wedge e_u^w = 0$$

$$(36) \quad e_u^v \wedge e_u^w + e_v^w \wedge e_v^u + e_w^u \wedge e_w^v = 0$$

and their opposites, and

$$(37) \quad e_u \wedge e_u^w + e_u^w \wedge e_v + e_u^v \wedge e_w^u = 0$$

and all permutations of u, v, w in this equation, plus all their conjugates.

6. CALCULUS ON GENERAL $D^*(\mathcal{A})$ AND T-DUALITY

Here we describe the differential calculus on a general quantum codouble Hopf algebra $D^*(\mathcal{A})$ associated to any $\mathcal{A}$ -crossed module. These are not in general all calculi (they are the block decomposition of the semisimple calculus Ω_{ss}) and we do not attempt a classification as we did for $D^*(G)$ above. Let $\mathcal{A}$ for the moment be a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra with dual $\mathcal{H}$ and $A = D^*(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{H}^{cop} \bowtie \mathcal{A}$ as in Section 5. Its coproduct and coquasitriangular structure are, in the conventions of [20],

$$\Delta(h \otimes a) = \sum h_{(1)} \otimes f^a a_{(1)} f^b \otimes (S e_a) h_{(1)} e_b \otimes a_{(2)}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(h \otimes a, g \otimes b) = \epsilon(a) \epsilon(g) \langle h, b \rangle, \quad \forall h, g \in \mathcal{H}, \quad a, b \in \mathcal{A}$$

where $\{e_a\}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\{f^a\}$ a dual basis. Meanwhile, $D(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{A}^{op} \bowtie \mathcal{H}$ has the product

$$(a \otimes h)(b \otimes g) = \sum b_{(1)} a \otimes h_{(2)} g \langle S h_{(1)}, b_{(1)} \rangle \langle h_{(3)}, b_{(3)} \rangle$$

as in [20]. According to Corollary 4.2 we get a matrix block calculus for any representation of $D(\mathcal{H})$, which means a (left) $\mathcal{H}$ -crossed module W . We let $\{e_\alpha\}$

be a basis for W , $\{f^\alpha\}$ a dual basis and $e_\alpha^\beta = e_\alpha \otimes f^\beta$ as in the previous section. We write the left crossed module action as $\triangleright$ and coaction as $\sum w^{(\bar{1})} \otimes w^{(\bar{\infty})}$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let W be an $\mathcal{H}$ -crossed module. The corresponding calculus $\Omega^1(D^*(\mathcal{A})) = \text{End}(W) \otimes D^*(\mathcal{A})$ has the relations*

$$\begin{aligned} dh &= \sum (h_{(2)} \triangleright e_\beta^{(\bar{\infty})} \otimes f^\beta) \text{Ad}_{e_\beta^{(\bar{1})}}(h_{(1)}) - \theta h \\ da &= \sum \langle \text{Ad}_{f^a}(a_{(1)}), e_\beta^{(\bar{1})} \rangle (e_\beta^{(\bar{\infty})} \otimes f^\beta) e_a a_{(2)} - \theta a \\ h.e_\alpha^\beta &= \sum h_{(2)} \triangleright e_\alpha \otimes f^\gamma \text{Ad}_{e_\gamma^{(\bar{1})}}(h_{(1)}) \langle e_\gamma^{(\bar{\infty})}, f^\beta \rangle \\ a.e_\alpha^\beta &= \sum e_\alpha \otimes f^\gamma \langle \text{Ad}_{f^a}(a_{(1)}), e_\gamma^{(\bar{1})} \rangle e_a \langle e_\gamma^{(\bar{\infty})}, f^\beta \rangle a_{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$, where Ad is the right adjoint action and $\theta = \sum e_\alpha^\alpha$.

Proof. From the definition of the matrices ρ we have

$$\rho(a) = \sum \langle a, e_\alpha^{(\bar{1})} \rangle e_\alpha^{(\bar{\infty})} \otimes f^\alpha, \quad \rho(h) = \sum h \triangleright e_\alpha \otimes f^\alpha.$$

We then use the above formulae for the quantum double and find in particular the required map

$$\mathcal{Q}_2(h \otimes a) = (1 \otimes h)(a \otimes 1) = \sum a_{(2)} \otimes h_{(2)} \langle Sh_{(1)}, a_{(1)} \rangle \langle h_{(3)}, a_{(3)} \rangle.$$

We then use (27), making routine Hopf algebra computations, including (for dh) the crossed-module compatibility conditions

$$\sum (h_{(1)} \triangleright g)^{(\bar{1})} h_{(2)} \otimes (h_{(1)} \triangleright g)^{(\bar{\infty})} = \sum h_{(1)} g^{(\bar{1})} \otimes h_{(2)} \triangleright g^{(\bar{\infty})}$$

to obtain the result. We use $\text{Ad}_h(g) = \sum (Sh_{(1)})gh_{(2)}$. Note also that $\sum f^a \otimes \text{Ad}_{e_a}(h)$ is the left $\mathcal{A}$ -coadjoint coaction on $\mathcal{H}$ adjoint to the right adjoint coaction $\text{Ad}(a) = \sum a_{(2)} \otimes (Sa_{(1)})a_{(3)}$ on $\mathcal{A}$. $\diamond$

Next, since $\mathcal{A}$ is the geometric quantity for us, it is useful to recast these results in terms of an $\mathcal{A}$ -crossed module. First, we can replace the left $\mathcal{H}$ coaction on W by a right action of $\mathcal{A}$ on W , and this by a left action of $\mathcal{A}$ on W^* . The result (after some computations) is

$$(38) \quad dh = \sum (h_{(2)} \triangleright e_\beta \otimes f^a \triangleright f^\beta) \text{Ad}_{e_a}(h_{(1)}) - \theta h$$

$$(39) \quad da = \sum (e_\beta \otimes \text{Ad}_{f^a}(a_{(1)}) \triangleright f^\beta) e_a a_{(2)} - \theta a$$

$$(40) \quad h.e_\alpha^\beta = \sum (h_{(2)} \triangleright e_\alpha \otimes f^a \triangleright f^\beta) \text{Ad}_{e_a}(h_{(1)})$$

$$(41) \quad a.e_\alpha^\beta = \sum (e_\alpha \otimes \text{Ad}_{f^a}(a_{(1)}) \triangleright f^\beta) e_a a_{(2)}.$$

We can also write the left action of $\mathcal{H}$ as a right $\mathcal{A}$ -coaction, or if possible a left $\mathcal{A}$ -coaction on W^* . Using the same notation for left coactions and $\sum w^{(\bar{0})} \otimes w^{(\bar{1})}$ for right coactions, the affected formulae become

$$\begin{aligned} dh &= \sum \langle h_{(2)}, f^{\beta(\bar{1})} \rangle (e_\beta \otimes f^a \triangleright f^{\beta(\bar{\infty})}) \text{Ad}_{e_a}(h_{(1)}) \\ h.e_\alpha^\beta &= \sum \langle h_{(2)}, e_\alpha^{(\bar{1})} \rangle (e_\alpha^{(\bar{0})} \otimes f^a \triangleright f^\beta) \text{Ad}_{e_a}(h_{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose $\mathcal{A}$ has a bicovariant calculus. Then $\bar{\Lambda}^1$ is a left $\mathcal{A}$ -crossed module as explained in Section 3 (a quotient of $\mathcal{A}^+$ under left multiplication and left adjoint

coaction). We therefore set $W = \bar{\Lambda}^{1*}$ in the above and obtain an *induced calculus* on $D^*(\mathcal{A})$. One may check easily that if the initial $\Omega^1(\mathcal{A})$ is inner with a generator $\bar{\theta}$ say, then

$$(42) \quad \pi(e_\alpha^\beta) = \langle e_\alpha, \bar{\theta} \rangle f^\beta, \quad \pi(h \otimes a) = \epsilon(h)a$$

defines a surjection $\Omega^1(D^*(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \Omega^1(\mathcal{A})$ extending the canonical Hopf algebra surjection $D^*(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ as stated.

Of course not all crossed modules are of the type which comes from an initial differential structure on $\mathcal{A}$. Let us give two examples, one which is and one (the first) which is not. They both show a different phenomenon whereby a calculus on $\mathcal{A}$ (and on $\mathcal{H}$) can instead be sometimes included in the calculus on the double. Note also that while the theory used is for finite-dimensional Hopf algebras, all formulae can be used also with appropriate care for infinite-dimensional Hopf algebras $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}$ dually paired (or skew-paired). For example, if $\mathcal{A} = k[G]$ is an algebraic group of Lie type dually paired with an enveloping algebra $\mathcal{H} = U(\mathfrak{g})$ then its double $D^*(G) = U(\mathfrak{g}) \triangleright k[G]$ is the tensor product algebra and as a coalgebra crossed by the coadjoint coaction, but the latter does not play a role in the differential structure that results. We let $\{e_i\}$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. We note that

$$(43) \quad \partial_i f \equiv \sum \langle e_i, f_{(1)} \rangle f_{(2)}, \quad \forall f \in k[G]$$

is the action of the classical right-invariant vector field generated by $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}$. We assume the summation convention for repeated such indices. We use the 2-action formulation (38)-(41).

Example 6.2. We take $W = \bar{\mathfrak{g}} = 1 \oplus \mathfrak{g} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$ as a subcrossed $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module under the left adjoint action and the regular coaction given by the coproduct. We write $e_0 = 1$ as the additional basis element and let $\{f^i, f^0\}$ be the dual basis. The left $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -crossed module structure and left action of $k[G]$ on W^* are

$$\xi \triangleright e_i = [\xi, e_i], \quad \xi \triangleright e_0 = 0, \quad \Delta_L e_i = e_i \otimes e_0 + 1 \otimes e_i, \quad \Delta_L e_0 = 1 \otimes e_0$$

$$f \triangleright f^i = f^i f(1), \quad f \triangleright f^0 = f^0 f(1) + f^i \langle e_i, f \rangle$$

for $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in k[G]$. Then the resulting calculus $\Omega^1(D^*(G))$ has structure

$$d\xi = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^i + e_0^i [\xi, e_i], \quad df = e_0^i \partial_i f$$

$$[\xi, e_0^0] = e_0^i [\xi, e_i], \quad [\xi, e_0^i] = 0, \quad [\xi, e_i^0] = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^0 + e_i^j [\xi, e_j]$$

$$[\xi, e_i^j] = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^j, \quad [f, e_\alpha^i] = 0, \quad [f, e_\alpha^0] = e_\alpha^i \partial_i f; \quad \alpha = 0, j.$$

Note that it is possible to restrict the calculus to basic forms of the type $\{e_i^j, e_0^i\}$ as a subcalculus $\Omega_{res}^1(D^*(G))$. When this is restricted to $k[G]$ we have $\Omega_{res}^1|_{k[G]} = \Omega^1(G)$ its usual classical calculus. When restricted to $U(\mathfrak{g})$ we have $\Omega_{res}^1|_{U(\mathfrak{g})}$ the calculus with $d\xi = \rho(\xi) + e_0^i [\xi, e_i]$ where the first term is a standard type for $\Omega^1(U(\mathfrak{g}))$ as a noncommutative space. Thus Ω_{res}^1 ‘factorizes’ into something close to these standard constructions. In fact we need not all $\text{span}\{e_i^j\}$ here but only the image $\rho(U(\mathfrak{g})^+)$ which could be different unless $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple. Also note that while the classical calculus on $k[G]$ is not inner, when viewed inside Ω_{res}^1 the element $\theta_0 = \sum e_i^i$ generates df . The full calculus above is necessarily inner, by construction.

As far as applications to physics are concerned let us note that if one (perversely) regards $U(su_2)$ as a noncommutative $\mathbb{R}^3$, i.e. as quantising the Kirillov-Kostant bracket then $D(SU_2)$ can be viewed as the appropriate deformation of the isometry group of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We refer to [1] for some recent work in this area. Hence if one wants to

construct an affine frame bundle etc. as in Section 2 then one will need a calculus on $D^*(SU_2)$ such as the above. Details will appear elsewhere [2].

Let us now give a different example on the same quantum double, this time of the type induced by a calculus on $k[G]$. If one tries to start with the classical calculus on $k[G]$, where $\bar{\Lambda}^1 = \mathfrak{g}^*$ the dual of the Lie algebra, one will get zero for differentials df in the induced calculus. That is why we had to work with an extension $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ above. Similarly, at least in characteristic zero (and assuming an invertible Killing form):

Example 6.3. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple Lie algebra over k and $c = \frac{1}{2}K^{ij}e_i e_j$ the quadratic Casimir defined by the inverse Killing form. We let $W = kc \oplus \mathfrak{g} = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \subset U(\mathfrak{g})^+$ as a subcrossed module under Ad and $\Delta_L = \Delta - \text{id} \otimes 1$. We write $e_0 = c$ to complete the basis of $\mathfrak{g}$. The left $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -crossed module structure and left action of $k[G]$ on W^* are*

$$\xi \triangleright e_i = [\xi, e_i], \quad \xi \triangleright e_0 = 0, \quad \Delta_L e_i = 1 \otimes e_i, \quad \Delta_L e_0 = 1 \otimes e_0 + K^{ij} e_i \otimes e_j$$

$$f \triangleright f^i = f^i f(1) + f^0 K^{mi} \langle e_m, f \rangle, \quad f \triangleright f^0 = f^0 f(1)$$

for $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $f \in k[G]$. Then the resulting calculus $\Omega^1(D^*(G))$ has structure

$$d\xi = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^i + e_i^0 K^{mi} [\xi, e_m], \quad df = e_i^0 K^{mi} \partial_m f$$

$$[\xi, e_0^0] = 0, \quad [\xi, e_0^i] = e_0^0 K^{mi} [\xi, e_m], \quad [\xi, e_i^0] = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^0$$

$$[\xi, e_i^j] = [\xi, e_i] \otimes f^j + e_i^0 K^{mj} [\xi, e_m], \quad [f, e_\alpha^0] = 0, \quad [f, e_\alpha^i] = e_\alpha^0 K^{mi} \partial_m f.$$

We use the same conventions as the previous example. Again we have a restricted subcalculus spanned by $\{e_i^j, e_i^0\}$ and indeed the restriction of this to $k[G]$ is again the classical calculus in terms of a new basis $e^m \equiv K^{mi} e_i$. The restriction to $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is different, however. Unlike the previous example, the input crossed module $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ here is of the form such that its dual is $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^* = \bar{\Lambda}^1$ for an initial differential structure $\Omega_{init}^1(\mathcal{A})$ on $\mathcal{A}$. Namely

$$(44) \quad df = f^i \partial_i f + f^0 \frac{1}{2} K^{ij} \partial_j \partial_i f, \quad [f, f^i] = f^0 K^{mi} \partial_m f, \quad [f, f^0] = 0$$

for all $f \in k[G]$. This is a standard 1-dimensional noncommutative extension of the usual classical calculus in which the second-order Laplacian evident here is viewed as a ‘first order’ partial derivative ∂_0 in the extra f^0 direction (the other ∂_i are the usual classical differentials as above). Thus a reasonable but noncommutative calculus can induce a reasonable one on the double.

Finally, we consider the above results as a step towards a ‘T-duality’ theory for differential calculi whereby Hopf algebra duality is extended to noncommutative geometry. In physics, Poisson-Lie T-duality refers to an equivalence between a σ -model on Poisson Lie group G and one on its Drinfeld dual G^* with dual Lie bialgebra, see [13, 5] and elsewhere. The transfer of solutions is via the Lie bialgebra double $D(\mathfrak{g})$. We could hope for a similar theory in the quantum group case. For this one would need first of all to extend the Hopf algebra duality functor to differentials. Our construction indicates a way to do this: given a calculus on $\mathcal{A}$ we can induce one on the codouble and then project that down to one on $\mathcal{H}$. Probably some modifications of this idea will be needed for nontrivial results (as the examples above already indicated) but this is a general idea for ‘transference of calculi’ that we propose.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Xavier Gomez for discussions. The author is a Royal Society University Research Fellow.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Batista and S. Majid. Noncommutative geometry of angular momentum space $U(su_2)$ *J. Math. Phys.* 44:107-137 (2003).
- [2] E. Batista and S. Majid. In preparation.
- [3] P. Bauman and F. Schmidt. Classification of bicovariant differential calculi over quantum groups (a representation-theoretic approach). *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 194:71–86, 1998.
- [4] E. Beggs and S. Majid. Quasitriangular and differential structures on bicrossproduct Hopf algebras. *J. Algebra*, 219:682–727, 1999.
- [5] E. Beggs and S. Majid. Poisson-Lie T-Duality for Quasitriangular Lie Bialgebras. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 220:455–488, 2001.
- [6] T. Brzeziński and S. Majid. Quantum differentials and the q -monopole revisited. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 54:185–232, 1998.
- [7] T. Brzeziński and S. Majid. Quantum group gauge theory on quantum spaces. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 157:591–638, 1993. Erratum 167:235, 1995.
- [8] A. Connes. *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press, 1994.
- [9] A. Connes. C^* algebras et géométrie différentielle. *C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris*, 290:599–604, 1980.
- [10] A. Connes and M. Rieffel. Yang-Mills theory over quantum tori. *Contemp. Math.*, 62:237, 1987.
- [11] V.G. Drinfeld. Quantum groups. In A. Gleason, ed., *Proceedings of the ICM*, pages 798–820, Rhode Island, 1987. AMS.
- [12] V.G. Drinfeld. QuasiHopf algebras. *Leningrad Math. J.*, 1:1419–1457, 1990.
- [13] C. Klimcik and P. Severa. Dual non-Abelian duality and the Drinfeld double. *Phys. Lett. B*, 351:455–462, 1995.
- [14] X. Gomez and S. Majid. Noncommutative cohomology and electromagnetism on $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_2]$ at roots of unity. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 60:221–237, 2002.
- [15] X. Gomez and S. Majid. Braided Lie algebras and bicovariant differential calculi over coquasitriangular Hopf algebras. *J. Algebra*, 261:334–388, 2003..
- [16] P. Hajac and S. Majid. Projective module description of the q -monopole. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 206:246–464, 1999.
- [17] I. Heckenberger and K. Schmüdgen. Classification of bicovariant differential calculi on the quantum groups $SL_q(n+1)$ and $Sp_q(2n)$. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 502:141–162, 1998.
- [18] B. Jurco. Differential calculi on quantized Lie groups. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 22:177–186, 1991.
- [19] S. Majid. Quasitriangular Hopf algebras and Yang-Baxter equations. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 5:1–91, 1990.
- [20] S. Majid. *Foundations of Quantum Group Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [21] S. Majid. Advances in quantum and braided geometry. In H.-D. Doebner and V.K. Dobrev, eds., *Quantum Group Symposium at Group XXI*, pp. 11–26. Heron Press, Sofia, 1997.
- [22] S. Majid. Classification of bicovariant differential calculi. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 25:119–140, 1998, math.QA/9608016.
- [23] S. Majid. Quantum and braided group Riemannian geometry. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 30:113–146, 1999.
- [24] S. Majid. Riemannian geometry of quantum groups and finite groups with nonuniversal differentials. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 225:131–170, 2002.
- [25] S. Majid. Ricci tensor and Dirac operator on $\mathbb{C}_q[SL_2]$ at roots of unity. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 63:39–54, 2003.
- [26] S. Majid. *A Quantum Groups Primer, L.M.S. Lect Notes* vol. 292. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [27] S. Majid and R. Oeckl. Twisting of quantum differentials and the Planck scale Hopf algebra. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 205:617–655, 1999.
- [28] S. Majid and T. Schucker. $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ lattice as a Connes-Lott-quantum group model. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 43:1–26, 2002.
- [29] T. Masuda, K. Mimachi, Y. Nakagami, M. Noumi, and K. Ueno. Representations of the quantum group $SU_q(2)$ and the little q -Jacobi polynomials. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 99:357–387, 1991.

- [30] F. Ngakeu, S. Majid, and J-P. Ezin. Cartan calculus for quantum differentials on bicrossproducts. *Preprint*, math.QA/0205194
- [31] N.Yu. Reshetikhin and M.A. Semenov-Tian-Shansky. Quantum R -matrices and factorization problems. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 5:533, 1990.
- [32] K. Schmüdgen and A. Schüler. Classification of bicovariant differential calculi on quantum groups. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 170:315–335, 1995.
- [33] S.L. Woronowicz. Differential calculus on compact matrix pseudogroups (quantum groups). *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 122:125–170, 1989.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, QUEEN MARY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, 327 MILE END RD, LONDON E1 4NS, UK.